

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

ROBERTO DURAND,

Plaintiff,

v.

ELY STATE PRISON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:19-CV-00460-ART-CLB

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO STRIKE  
ECF NOS. 37 AND 38**

[ECF Nos. 40, 41]

On May 11, 2022, the Court denied Plaintiff Roberto Durand's ("Durand") motions for default and to compel. (ECF No. 36.) Four days later, Durand filed two documents which are Ninth Circuit forms to respond to a motion or Court Order. (ECF Nos. 37, 38.) The first response addresses the Court's denial of the motion for default. (ECF No. 37.) The second response mentions both the motion for default and the motion to compel which were denied by this Court. (ECF No. 38.)

Defendants move to strike both responses because they do not understand the purpose of filing these forms as neither complies with the Local Rules, the handwriting is illegible, and the responses are not supported by a memorandum of points and authorities. LR IA 10-1(a)(2), LR 7-2(a). The Court concurs with the Defendants and hereby **GRANTS** the motions to strike. (ECF Nos. 40, 41.) The Clerk shall **STRIKE** the responses from the docket. (ECF Nos. 37, 38.)

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED:** May 31, 2022.

  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**